

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of
Julka, et al.

Serial No.: **10/672,233**

Filed: **September 25, 2003**

For: **A Method and Apparatus for Efficient
Dormant Handoff of Mobile Stations Having
Multiple Packet Data Service Instances**

Docket No: **4740-223**

PATENT PENDING

Examiner: Fred A. Casca

Group Art Unit: 2617

Confirmation No.: 8712

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☐ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

June 17, 2008

Date

Laura A. Wade

This correspondence is being:

- ☒ electronically submitted via EFS-Web


TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

The undersigned attorney received a phone call from Examiner Casca today, regarding the above-identified application. The application is under final rejection and Applicant has submitted an after-final response. No Advisory Action has been received. The examiner stated that he was strongly considering issuing a restriction against the application. The undersigned attorney pointed out that the examiner had completed examination in this case and closed prosecution on the merits, with his final rejection issuance. Given this disposition, the undersigned attorney argued that reopening prosecution for the purpose of issuing a restriction requirement would be improper and would not serve the interests of Applicant or the Office. The undersigned attorney also requested that the examiner verbally outline the basis for restriction, and the examiner kindly complied. The examiner noted that the "indicator" in independent claim 17 was not found in independent claim 1 or in any of its dependent claims. The undersigned attorney pointed out that claims 1 and 17 related to complementary operations at a base station and a packet control function (PCF). The examiner then stated that he would reconsider the

intent to re-open/restrict. Given that indication, the undersigned attorney is unclear as to whether the Office will re-open prosecution, or will instead issue an advisory action.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Murphy
Registration No.: 44,958

Dated: June 17, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084